



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,047	04/18/2001	Roger Everette Sanders	343355600028	9203
24325	7590	11/19/2010	EXAMINER	
PATENT GROUP 2N			ROSWELL, MICHAEL	
JONES DAY				
NORTH POINT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE				2173
CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		11/19/2010		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/837,047	SANDERS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHAEL ROSWELL	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 20-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 20-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20100708</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed 20 November 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 8-11, 20-23, 30-35, and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin et al (US Patent 6,208,340), hereinafter Amin, in view of Nagarajayya et al (US Patent 5,940,078), hereinafter Nagarajayya.

Regarding claim 1, Amin teaches a computer-implemented method of selecting one or more data records within a graphical user interface, comprising: providing, using one or more processors, a first control, and a pull-down control button, wherein the first control operates within a window of the graphical user interface (taught as the drop-down list graphical user interface of col. 1, line 57 through col. 2, line 4, and further at col. 3, lines 10-19, wherein the drop-down menu includes a first control for accessing the drop-down menu); manipulating the first control using the pull-down control button to display a second control within the window that contains the first control, wherein the second control operates within the first control, and wherein the second control includes the one or more data records from a database (taught as the menu system of col. 3, lines 10-30, where the drop-down menu includes items related to

database software, at col. 2, lines 61-65); and selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control, wherein when a data record is selected using the second control (taught as the selection of menu items in the drop-down menu, at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Amin fails to explicitly teach the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

Nagarajayya teaches a method for displaying an icon related to a graphical user interface menu, similar to the graphical widget label disclosed by Amin. Furthermore, Nagarajayya teaches wherein the displayed icon is related to the underlying properties, states, and methods related to the icon image, at col. 4, lines 54-59, and col. 6, lines 19-23.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin and Nagarajayya before him at the time the invention was made to modify the drop-down menu including a graphical label of Amin to include the varying icon appearance based on related properties of Nagarajayya in order to obtain the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of providing an icon on a graphical user interface that allows a user to easily distinguish whether or not an event affecting the icon has occurred. See Nagarajayya, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 3.

Regarding claim 8, Amin teaches selecting a data record; and indicating a selection status of the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3, and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 9, Amin teaches wherein the selection status is presented proximate to the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3, and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Amin teaches selecting multiple data records as a group and indicating the selection status of each selected data record in the group (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, which may thus be considered to be grouped, at col. 4, lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 20, Amin teaches wherein the second control includes separate checkbox interface items corresponding to each of the one or more data records, wherein multiple checkbox interface items can be concurrently selected, and wherein data records selected through their associated checkbox interface items are used as data by a software application (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, at col. 4, lines 54-57. The menu system of Amin is related to software applications, as disclosed at col. 2, lines 61-65).

Regarding claim 21, Amin teaches a computer-implemented system for selecting one or more data records within a graphical user interface, comprising: one or more processors; one or more computer-readable storage mediums containing software instructions executable on the one or more processors to cause the one or more processors to perform operations including: providing a first control, and a pull-down control button, wherein the first control operates within a window of the graphical user interface (taught as the drop-down list graphical user interface of col. 1, line 57 through col. 2, line 4, and further at col. 3, lines 10-19, wherein the drop-down

menu includes a first control for accessing the drop-down menu); manipulating the first control using the pull-down control button to display a second control within the window that contains the first control, wherein the second control operates within the first control, and wherein the second control includes the one or more data records from a database (taught as the menu system of col. 3, lines 10-30, where the drop-down menu includes items related to database software, at col. 2, lines 61-65); and selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control, wherein when a data record is selected using the second control (taught as the selection of menu items in the drop-down menu, at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Amin fails to explicitly teach the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

Nagarajayya teaches a method for displaying an icon related to a graphical user interface menu, similar to the graphical widget label disclosed by Amin. Furthermore, Nagarajayya teaches wherein the displayed icon is related to the underlying properties, states, and methods related to the icon image, at col. 4, lines 54-59, and col. 6, lines 19-23.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin and Nagarajayya before him at the time the invention was made to modify the drop-down menu including a graphical label of Amin to include the varying icon appearance based on related properties of Nagarajayya in order to obtain the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of providing an icon on a graphical user interface that allows a user to easily distinguish whether or

not an event affecting the icon has occurred. See Nagarajayya, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 3.

Regarding claim 22, Amin teaches one or more computer-readable storage mediums encoded with instructions that when executed, cause one or more computers to perform a method of selecting one or more data records within a graphical user interface, the method comprising: providing a first control and a pull-down control button, wherein the first control operates within a window of the graphical user interface (taught as the drop-down list graphical user interface of col. 1, line 57 through col. 2, line 4, and further at col. 3, lines 10-19, wherein the drop-down menu includes a first control for accessing the drop-down menu); manipulating the first control using the pull-down control button to display a second control within the window that contains the first control, wherein the second control operates within the first control, and wherein the second control includes the one or more data records from a database (taught as the menu system of col. 3, lines 10-30, where the drop-down menu includes items related to database software, at col. 2, lines 61-65); and selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control, wherein when a data record is selected using the second control (taught as the selection of menu items in the drop-down menu, at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Amin fails to explicitly teach the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

Nagarajayya teaches a method for displaying an icon related to a graphical user interface menu, similar to the graphical widget label disclosed by Amin. Furthermore, Nagarajayya teaches wherein the displayed icon is related to the underlying properties, states, and methods related to the icon image, at col. 4, lines 54-59, and col. 6, lines 19-23.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin and Nagarajayya before him at the time the invention was made to modify the drop-down menu including a graphical label of Amin to include the varying icon appearance based on related properties of Nagarajayya in order to obtain the first control including a graphical state indicator indicative of a selection status, and selecting the corresponding state indicator of the first control in response to selecting at least one of the one or more data records using the second control.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of providing an icon on a graphical user interface that allows a user to easily distinguish whether or not an event affecting the icon has occurred. See Nagarajayya, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 3.

Regarding claim 23, Amin teaches wherein the graphical state indicator is represented by a check-box, and wherein the pull-down control button is represented by an icon (taught as the graphical widget labels and check-box interface of col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 30, Amin teaches instructions executable on the one or more processors to cause the one or more processors to perform operations including: selecting a data record; and indicating a selection status of the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3 and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 31, Amin teaches wherein the selection status is presented proximate to the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3 and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 32 and 33, Amin teaches selecting multiple data records as a group and indicating the selection status of each selected data record in the group (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, which may thus be considered to be grouped, at col. 4, lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 34, Amin teaches wherein the second control includes separate checkbox interface items corresponding to each of the one or more data records, wherein multiple checkbox interface items can be concurrently selected, and wherein data records selected through their associated checkbox interface items are used as data by a software application (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, at col. 4, lines 54-57. The menu system of Amin is related to software applications, as disclosed at col. 2, lines 61-65).

Regarding claim 35, Amin teaches wherein the graphical state indicator is represented by a checkbox, and wherein the pull-down control button is represented by an icon (taught as the graphical widget labels and check-box interface of col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 42, Amin teaches selecting a data record; and indicating a selection status of the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3, and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 43, Amin teaches wherein the selection status is presented proximate to the selected data record (as can be seen in Fig. 3, and disclosed at col. 3, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 44 and 45, Amin teaches selecting multiple data records as a group and indicating the selection status of each selected data record in the group (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, which may thus be considered to be grouped, at col. 4, lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 46, Amin teaches wherein the second control includes separate checkbox interface items corresponding to each of the one or more data records, wherein multiple checkbox interface items can be concurrently selected, and wherein data records selected through their associated checkbox interface items are used as data by a software application (taught as the ability to simultaneously select multiple menu choices in a drop-down menu, at col. 4, lines 54-57. The menu system of Amin is related to software applications, as disclosed at col. 2, lines 61-65).

Regarding claim 47, Amin teaches wherein the graphical state indicator is represented by a checkbox, and wherein the pull-down control button is represented by an icon (taught as the graphical widget labels and check-box interface of col. 3, lines 10-30).

Claims 2-7, 24-29, and 36-41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin, in view of Nagarajayya, further in view of Khan (US Patent 6,546,393).

Regarding claims 2, 24, and 36, Amin and Nagarajayya have been shown to teach a method as in claims 1, 21, and 22. However, Amin and Nagarajayya fail to explicitly teach storing the selected data record in a database.

Khan teaches a method including a graphical user interface menu system similar to that of Amin and Nagarajayya. Furthermore, Khan teaches storing selected data records in a database (taught as the storing of selected bookmarks in an online account, at col. 16, lines 1-8, the bookmarks being selected through a graphical user interface as seen in Fig. 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin, Nagarajayya and Khan before him at the time the invention was made to modify the interface of Amin and Nagarajayya to include the storage of selected elements in a database, as in Khan.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of allowing the persistence of selected features and options. See Khan, col. 16, lines 3-8.

Regarding claims 3, 25, and 37, Amin and Nagarajayya have been shown to teach a method as in claims 1, 21, and 22. However, Amin and Nagarajayya fail to explicitly teach wherein a pop-up window provides a menu of operations configured to perform actions on a selected data record appearing within the second control.

Khan teaches a method including a graphical user interface menu system similar to that of Amin and Nagarajayya. Furthermore, Khan teaches the use of a pop-up window for providing a menu for the manipulation selected data records, as seen in Fig. 8, and disclosed at col. 15, lines 56-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin, Nagarajayya and Khan before him at the time the invention was made to modify the interface of Amin and Nagarajayya to include the pop-up menus of Khan, in order to obtain a menu system wherein a pop-up window provides a menu of operations configured to perform actions on a selected data record appearing within the second control.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of “making the user’s life easier”, i.e. user-friendliness. See Khan, col. 15, lines 53-55.

Regarding claims 4, 26, and 38, Amin and Nagarajayya have been shown to teach a method as in claims 1, 21, and 22. However, Amin and Nagarajayya fail to explicitly teach wherein the second control is configured to display data records from two or more data sources including a database, a record source, and a dynamic record generator.

Khan teaches a method including a graphical user interface menu system similar to that of Amin and Nagarajayya. Furthermore, Khan teaches the ability to import data from multiple sources, at col. 16, lines 16-24.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin, Nagarajayya and Khan before him at the time the invention was made to modify the interface of Amin and Nagarajayya to include the multiple data sources of Khan, in order to obtain an interface wherein the second control is configured to display data records from two or more data sources including a database, a record source, and a dynamic record generator.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of importing data from wherever a user wants, and whenever the user wants to import the data. See Khan, col. 16, lines 22-24.

Regarding claims 5-7, 27-29, and 29-41, Amin and Nagarajayya have been shown to teach a method as in claims 1, 21, and 22. However, Amin and Nagarajayya fail to explicitly teach using the second control to add a new data record to the database; using the second

control to delete a data record from the database; and using the second control to rename a data record.

Khan teaches a method including a graphical user interface menu system similar to that of Amin and Nagarajayya. Furthermore, Khan teaches the ability to add, delete, and rename data records through a second control, as seen in the menu of Fig. 8, which lists “Delete” and “Rename” as menu options, and further adding data through a pop-up window menu as seen in Fig. 14, at disclosed at col. 17, lines 1-16.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Amin, Nagarajayya and Khan before him at the time the invention was made to modify the interface of Amin and Nagarajayya to include the data record manipulation of Khan in order to obtain an interface using the second control to add a new data record to the database; using the second control to delete a data record from the database; and using the second control to rename a data record.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of “making the user’s life easier”, i.e. user-friendliness. See Khan, col. 15, lines 53-55.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 20-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ROSWELL whose telephone number is (571)272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Roswell /MICHAEL ROSWELL/
11/16/2010